The Common Interests Which Link Nasser and the U.S. Oil Industry, See Page 2

# I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. IV, NO. 46 DECEMBER 3, 1956 101 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

# Why the U. S. "Falters" in Hungary and the Middle East

The phone rang in that sunny State Department office, and the pleasant elderly woman in charge answered. "Oh, it's very quiet here this week," she assured her caller. The President was golfing in Georgia, the Secretary of State convalescing in Florida. The Under Secretary of State, when not commuting between them, was unavailable; Mr. Herbert Hoover, Jr., the only Under Secretary of State who has never held a press conference, saw no reason to hold one now. From Georgia, America's ranking active statesman, James Hagerty, opined that the situation seemed to have improved; he must have been watching the fairway. In devastated Budapest, the general strike was in its second month; 90,000 Hungarians had fled. The whole Soviet world was tensed for the next outbreak. A new war seemed to be brewing in the Middle East, this time between Iraq and Syria. In Egypt, the bulk of the UN police force was still stalled at the Abu Suweir airfield. Europe was running out of gas, and England and France were swept by anti-American feeling. But it was quiet here in Washington. Ambassadors desperately seeking some line on policy were shunted off to assistant secretaries who knew no more than they did. The sign on the door knob read plainly, "Do not disturb." The leadership of the free world was resting.

### An Unspoken Spheres of Interest Agreement?

This picture is not to be written off merely as the result of illness or incapacity. Inaction, too, can be a form of action, and reflect fundamental long range policy. To glance back at the events of the past month is to see that the government's behavior, as distinct from its utterance, assumes a pattern. The pattern in Europe is to act as if there were a spheres of influence agreement with the Russians. When the U.S. does not even protest the abduction of Imre Nagy and drags its feet on Hungary at the UN, as first Dulles and then Lodge did, it signals to Moscow that we have adopted a complete hands off policy toward Eastern Europe, *perhaps in the hope that the Russians will thus be more ready to keep hands off the Middle East, where our material interests lie.* Those of us who complained that the U.S. missed a chance to help Eastern Europe by challenging the Russians to withdraw their armies if we withdrew ours from Western Europe were misled. Judging by its behavior, the U.S. is not interested in the "liberation" of Eastern Europe; it is not prepared to give up its forward bases in Western Europe as the price of forcing a Russian withdrawal. Washington is set on West German rearmament, still hopes to force unification on its own terms, fears that a withdrawal might leave Germany free to make a deal with the East. U.S. policy is satisfied to have Europe divided into two zones. To revise these plans because Budapest rose against the Russians may seem sentimental nonsense at the Pentagon.

A similarly hard-boiled view may be discerned beneath the rhetoric about the UN and the "rule of law" in the Middle East. Policy there is made by oil and its premise is to win the friendship of the Arabs. We are prepared to defend England and France in Europe but not in the Mediterranean. There we conceive of them as "through" and feel that the sooner their hold is liquidated the faster a new stability can be created. The U.S. oil industry would like to take over the whole area; it is not worried about the Russians, it feels that it has both the markets and the marketing facilities without which Arab oil is valueless. When Israel attacked Egypt, the first intention was to demonstrate U.S. friendship for the Arabs by a special session of Congress and sanctions against Israel. The intervention of England and France upset these plans, but in insisting on their withdrawal "forthwith" we are pursuing essentially the same line. Once Britain and France are out, dollars can be used to cement a new kind of colonialism; the Moslem world from Casablanca to Karachi can be brought into the American sphere of influence; it is anxious to enter the sunny orbit of the Treasury. And if Russia acquiesces, we can help her smooth out the difficulties in Eastern Europe. This is the Grand Design visible behind the unruffled, almost smug, surface of Washington. The trouble is that it may underestimate the explosive nature of the situation, the unsteadiness in the Kremlin and the temptations of the Middle East.

### Military Strategy at A Dead End

**What made the headlines in that interview with Gen. Lauris Norstad, the new NATO commander, was "Warning to Russia: 'We Are Not Bluffing'." Too little attention was paid to the revelation that Gen. Norstad takes the defeatist view that Europe cannot be defended without atomic weapons, a form of defense little of Europe could survive. Here (from the text in U.S. News & World Report, Nov. 30) is the overlooked warning:**

**"Q. Is it your conviction, General Norstad, that nuclear weapons definitely will be used if a general war comes?**

**"A. Our plans are based on the full and prompt use of atomic weapons in the event of a general war. . . .**

**"Q. You say your planning is based on atomic weapons. Has the decision been made that they will be used?**

**"A. If our forces are ordered into war, our plans—which have been approved by the NATO Council—call for the use of atomic weapons. . . .**

**"Q. If you were prohibited from using atomic weapons, could you defend Europe?**

**"A. In the event of a general war, the answer is 'No!' The answer is 'No!' . . .**

**"Q. We've been talking about the defense of Western Europe. But does NATO have enough ready strength to win a global war, if Russia attacked?**

**"A. It's very doubtful if anyone would 'win' a modern war. But I believe that anyone who attacked the NATO family of nations would be defeated."**

**But a war nobody could win is a war in which both sides would be defeated. This is strategy at a dead end.**



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

**Those 1st Amendment Contempt Cases Can Only Be Won in the Court of Public Opinion**

# Nobody Any Longer Seems to Remember Why the Pilgrim Fathers Left

The *New York Times* deserves credit for standing by the three staff members indicted here last week for contempt of the Eastland committee. They were retained in their jobs after they defied the committee last January. The *Times* in a statement after the indictment said their status as employes "will continue unchanged until there is a final disposition of the case." This is an improvement over the paper's earlier position when it discharged employes for invoking the Fifth amendment. But it does not measure up to the responsibility which rests on America's leading newspaper. Its three staff members and the other three persons indicted are the victims of an inquisition. Their conviction is all but a foregone conclusion; their trial will settle nothing except the need for a great campaign of public education to make America aware of the issues at stake. Since freedom of the press is among them, the *Times* ought to take the leadership.

With all the weeping and wailing over Hungary, how many Americans have been made aware that the Senate Internal Security Committee and the House Un-American Activities Committee have been operating on the same premise philosophically as the Hungarian dictatorship? This premise is that certain ideas are "subversive" and malignant and that those who hold these ideas ought to be rooted out, proscribed, ostracized and relegated to second class citizenship. The minds of Eastland and Walter are in this respect just like the minds of Rakosi and Gero, and we hope Chairman Walter (who is capable of deeper insights on occasion) caught some glimpse of this as he stood recently at the Hungarian border.

**Why Would They Be Punished—For Failing to Join?**

**"Fifteen [New York City school teachers] denied past or present membership in the Communist party. No present action is contemplated against them."**

*—From a New York Times news story, "Schools Query 59 About Red Links" Nov. 26.*

Crime is crime but ideas are ideas. Conscience is a man's own. A healthy society rests on free debate. These schoolbook maxims need to be driven home in the only way which gives any maxims vitality—by applying them where it hurts, to ourselves and against our own preconceptions, and in defense of our own heretics: Communists, past and present, real and suspected. If Congress has a right to determine what ideas are safe in this country, then all six of these people committed contempt—and should be hailed as heroes for it. In invoking rights of conscience and the First amendment they invoked the most fundamental traditions of our society. These have been tarnished, corrupted, dirtied and perverted. When will the respectables like the *New York Times* really stand up and say it LOUD?

**Not to Be Forgotten**

**The dimensions of the fedayeen problem which faced Israel is indicated by this Associated Press dispatch from Amman, Transjordan, which we saw only in the Washington Post (Nov. 26). It said "An Egyptian delegation is reported here to arrange the repatriation of about 1200 fedayeen (Arab commandoes) from the Gaza strip who are said to have reached Jordan after seven days wandering around Israel. . . . A like number are said to have been interned in Syria."**

This fight will only be settled in the court of public opinion. The courts at their best, as in the *Emspak* and more recently the *Lamont* case, have fallen back on technicalities as if afraid to apply the First Amendment. Besides these six, there are a dozen or more similar lonely contempt cases now kicking around on appeal, the best known being that of Harvey O'Connor. Many of these people are friendless and lack funds. Several dozen New York City schoolteachers are in the same plight, victims of the same neo-inquisition. Is there no way to bring together an organized group to help all these cases not just financially but by creating a new climate of opinion? The principle involved is the oldest and most precious of our great American tradition—it goes straight back to the Pilgrim Fathers who fled to Holland and then America rather than submit to the English Inquisition, and to inform upon their friends. Is it not a mark of national degeneracy that so few people realize this, and so fewer ever mention it?

*In this connection we pause to record with cheers the final dismissal of all the indictments against the Louisville Seven, to take our hat off to Kentucky State Criminal Court Judge L. R. Curtis for his decision, to ask whether the Louisville Courier-Journal will now offer Carl Braden his old job back, and to pat the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee on the back for all it did to help these brave and isolated people. Their courage and ultimate vindication of a shameless frameup should help put backbone in the more favored but less brave.*

## Nasser and the U. S. Oil Industry Have Certain Interests in Common

**In watching the Middle Eastern situation, it is important to keep your eye on oil. Here are some basic pointers:**

**Two pipelines run across Syria, one from the British owned Iraq fields, one from the American owned Saudi Arabian fields. The former has been put out of commission by the Syrians, the second is operating normally, delivering almost 325,000 barrels daily to Lebanon in October. Royalties from the Saudi Arabian operations have helped finance Nasser and the bribing of the Syrian and Jordanian parliaments. If Iraq and Turkey attack Syria, it will be to break the Syrian hold on the pipelines which carry Iraq's (British) oil to market.**

**British and U.S. oil companies are rivals in the Middle East. U.S. oil companies work through Ibn Saud, British through Iraq's foxy old statesman, Nuri Said Pasha. U.S. oil company influence would be against arming Iraq, and may explain the State Department's reluctance to supply Iraq with arms. Through Ibn Saud the U.S. oil companies are allied with Nasser.**

**An oil famine is spreading in Western Europe. The government is using that to put the squeeze on Britain and France to get out of Suez. An emergency supply committee is ready to go into operation but will not do so until they evacuate.**

**But this is not the only reason for delay. The U.S. oil industry sees the Suez crisis as a way to liquidate heavy inventories of both crude oil and gasoline. It is therefore in no hurry to expand production. Excess productive capacity today, i.e. the additional amounts which could be taken from existing wells without exceeding MER (maximum efficiency rates) is 2,000,000 barrels a day—as compared with the 1,880,000 barrels a day West Europe has been getting from the Middle East. Extra transport, of course, would be a problem but not an insoluble one.**

**The industry, however, sees the Suez crisis as temporary, a means of using up surpluses and a spur to higher oil and tanker prices. The U.S. oil industry and Nasser have a common interest in maintaining the squeeze on Western Europe.**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

**The Use of Faceless Informers in Passport Cases Finally Heads For A Test**

# Unproven Rosenberg Linkages Utilized by Dulles to Hound A Physicist

In Federal District Court here in Washington last week, the State Department finally embarked on what promises to be the first test of its right to use "faceless informers" in denying passports. The case was that of the physicist, Weldon Bruce Dayton. Hitherto, as in the Leonard Boudin case, the Department has preferred to back down and issue a passport rather than risk an adverse higher court opinion on secret evidence. So far only one Federal judge, Youngdahl, has ruled squarely that confidential information could not be the basis for denying passports. The Court of Appeals last September 13 in the case of Dayton sent the passport application back to State Department with instructions to specify whether, what and why anonymous accusations were used. The Court implied that it would then pass on the propriety of using undisclosed evidence. The Secretary of State thereupon filed specific findings. Motions for summary judgment by both sides were argued before Judge McGarraghy last Monday.

Dayton has been through the mill of three extensive grand jury appearances in connection with the Rosenberg case. Though he was never indicted, the Department may be counting on unproven warmed over linkages with the Rosenbergs to win this case for them, and establish a precedent for others. Dayton has not only denied under oath any connection with the Rosenbergs or espionage but has also denied that he was ever a Communist. Prize remark of the opening argument came after Dayton's counsel, Harry I. Rand, cited these denials. The young attorney for the Department of Justice replied that Dayton might not have been a Communist but he "had a proclivity for making friends of people left of center." This is a new addition to the criminal code.

Though Dayton emerged innocent from prolonged grand jury inquiry, the Department has in effect convicted and punished him on its own. Unable to obtain work in this country, Dayton several years ago accepted an invitation to work on cosmic rays (non military) at the famous Tata Research Institute in India. The Department denied him a passport. The four grounds specified by the Secretary of State are (1) association with a Science for Victory Committee at the University of California in 1943-44; (2) that Dayton was associated at Ithaca, N. Y., with another scientist, Alfred Sarant, who fled to Mexico in 1950 after being interrogated by the FBI in the Rosenberg case (the Secretary claims to have confidential information that Sarant—*not Dayton*—was involved in the Rosenberg ring); (2) that Dayton was "present on more than one occasion" in a New York apartment said "confidentially" to have been used on other occasions by Rosenberg for microfilming; and (4) that Dr. Bernard Peters with whom Dayton would work at the Tata Institute "is *suspected*" (italics added) according to the Department's confidential information "of being a Communist espionage agent."

On the basis of these findings, none of which allege any wrongdoing on Dayton's part, the Secretary finds that "the applicant is going abroad to engage in activities which will advance the Communist movement." This is itself a lovely non-sequitur. The net result is to smear Peters and ruin Dayton. This is the same Secretary of State who speaks so loftily about the "rule of law."

## It Will Be A Memorable Evening

Don't forget the night of Friday, Dec. 14, the *Weekly* is holding a public meeting at the Community Church, 40 E. 35th Street, New York City, to commemorate the anniversary of the Bill of Rights with a panel discussion of its meaning in the light of events in Eastern Europe. How can basic freedoms be preserved under socialism? What can the Soviet bloc learn from our Bill of Rights? What can we learn from events in the Soviet bloc about the danger of permitting fundamental political liberties to be eroded at home? To discuss these questions we have invited editors of independent Left and socialist publications to contribute their varying points of view in a panel discussion. I. F. Stone will be moderator. So far A. J. Muste of *Liberation*, Daniel Roberts of the *Militant*, Bert Cochran of the *American Socialist* and Hal Draper of *Labor Action* have agreed to participate. Paul Sweezy of the *Monthly Review* must speak at Bard College that night but will send a message. There will be a minimum of speech-making and a maximum of discussion encouraged from the audience itself. We look forward to a memorable meeting. It will start at 8 p.m. sharp and close at 11 p.m. Admission $1 (but 50 cents for students and anyone who cannot afford more). Come and express *your* opinion.

## Documentary: London DW Writer Tells How His Reports from Budapest Were Suppressed

From the Nov. 17 issue of the London *Daily Express* just arrived here we present this excerpt from a vivid document: Peter Fryer's story telling why he resigned from the London *Daily Worker* after it suppressed his reporting from Budapest:

"I sent altogether three dispatches—from Budapest two, and one from Vienna. The first story was a straightforward account of what I had seen as soon as I arrived at Hegyeshalom on the night of October 26. I described the rejoicing of the people at their national revolution over a ruthless police dictatorship. I described, without in any sense approving of mob justice, the lynching of AVH men (secret police).

"I described the frightful atrocity at Magyarovar, where 12 hours after I crossed the border I had been shown the bodies of 80 working people machine-gunned in cold blood by AVH men, one of whom I later saw lynched. I described the election of a new workers committee which I saw at the big State farm at Babolna. And I described the general situation in Budapest. This dispatch was not used. The assistant editor of the Daily Worker instructed me to return home. . . .

"The second dispatch was an interview with a British Communist called Charles Coutts, who is the English editor of World Youth, published in Budapest. He had been working in Budapest for three years, and he described the causes and the future prospects of the Hungarian revolution. . . .

"For the first edition of the Daily Worker it was cut and cut ruthlessly . . . Matthews [acting editor] cut out, for example, Coutts's reference to there being no democratic discussion within the Hungarian party. . . . There were many protests from members of the staff at the way Matthews had cut this piece and as a result . . . it was partly restored.

"The third dispatch I filed soon after arriving at the Bristol Hotel in Vienna on November 11. . . . It described certain excesses committed by Soviet troops in the heat of battle. I saw the result of one of them. I saw an old man of 70 lying on the pavement as late as Thursday, dead, with a loaf of bread still in his hand. He had been shot by a Soviet tank as he came away from a bread shop. . . .

"I argued that there was no 'white terror' in Hungary. I asked: 'If the Soviet intervention was necessary to put down counter revolution, how is it to be explained that some of the fiercest resistance of all was in the working class districts of Ujpest and Csepel?'"

[This dispatch was not published.] "In fact the editor [J. R. Campbell] who had that day returned from Moscow, refused to let other members of the staff read it."



LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

**A Page Devoted to the Higher Confusions: Introducing the "Moral Size" Atom Bomb**

# The AEC's Murray Revises the Gospel for Nuclear Warfare

We confess ourselves dismayed by the speech Atomic Energy Commissioner Thomas E. Murray made here in Washington on November 10 when he was presented with the 1956 award of the Catholic Association for International Peace. Mr. Murray is the lone dissenter of the AEC, a man of genuine piety. He sparked the Stevenson position on H-bomb tests and has probably done more than any other single individual except Nehru to arouse world opinion to the dangers of an H-bomb race. But it seems to us that the thesis he expounded on accepting the Catholic peace award began with a myth and ended in a monstrosity; it is appalling to see it taken seriously in so many quarters.

The myth is a "Christian tradition of civilized warfare" to which Mr. Murray would have us return. To deflate this notion is not a tactless exercise in denigration but the necessary exposure of the painful fact that human slaughter is as often due to good as bad rationalizations. The truth is that warfare has always been least civilized when rooted in, or disguised by, religious or quasi-religious motivations. Christian warfare is a sub-species of ideological warfare, and shares its merciless fury.

Except for the wars of the French Revolution, which were quasi-religious or ideological, the most devastating orgy of mass murder until our own times was the Thirty Years War in which Protestant and Catholic ravaged the German lands in mutual hatred. The "Christian tradition of civilized warfare" reached the pagan New World in that bloody plunder of Aztec and Inca which first put the Glory of God in Western Europe solidly on the gold standard. In our lifetime we have seen two World Wars out of Christian Europe, and Hiroshima was a product of the same civilization.

The rich genius of this civilization for double-talk and double-think is demonstrated by Mr. Murray himself. Appealing to "the high principles of justice that lie at the heart of the Western tradition of civilized warfare," Mr. Murray advocates "rational nuclear armament," based on the use of the smaller sized atomic weapons which he regards as "moral."

It would be hard to equal this for lush confusion. Just how can nuclear warfare be "rational" and "moral?" Mr. Murray leaves this worse confounded by arguing not for the abolition but for the limitation of the larger size weapons. He says "there are only a limited number of uses, militarily and morally justifiable, to which the larger bombs might be put." This implies that even the big bombs may be morally used on some special occasions, on which presumably the Strategic Air Command would be justified in blowing all mankind to Kingdom Come. When as good a man as Mr. Murray slides into such folly, it is a measure of how far humanity in our time has slipped its moorings.

### Almost As Bad

**"George Washington University's policy of limiting its faculty to believers in God was denounced yesterday from a Washington pulpit. The Rev. Dr. A. Powell Davies of All Souls' Church (Unitarian) . . . reviewed the religious attitudes of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln and expressed doubt that either could meet [GW President Cloyd Heck] Marvin's test. 'What an awful headline it would make,' Dr. Davies said: 'George Washington Refused Place on George Washington Faculty.'"** —*Washington Post, Nov. 26.*

If Dr. Marvin wants to keep the minds of his students really untarnished, he had better bar Unitarians from the faculty as well as agnostics.

### Reassuring Note

Connoisseurs of military theology may find a tidbit worth filing away in a plane-side press conference remark by General Alfred M. Gruenther on returning to Washington Nov. 23. "There is no better way to preserve our religious civilization," the retiring NATO commander told reporters, "than through the alliance system." Nobody was impious enough to ask him if he included the Warsaw pact among these celestial instruments.

The remark recalled a full dress interview with Gruenther last year by Adelbert Weinstein, military expert of West Germany's leading paper, the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*. Weinstein wrote that in talking with Gruenther he had a strange feeling he had met someone like him before. Afterwards he recalled that the General's manner and way of talking reminded him of a Jesuit with whom Weinstein had been in a prisoner of war camp. Weinstein said Gruenther told him that in his youth he was attracted to the priesthood (Gruenther is of German Catholic origin) but decided on West Point instead.

Thus should Gruenther succeed Dulles, we will again have a Secretary of State in close touch with God.

***Thank You For The Many Kind Messages Coming In With This Year's (Record-Breaking) Renewals***

**And**

**Keep December 14**

**Open**

**(See Box, Page 3)**

*I. F. Stone's Weekly*
Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S. E.
Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Washington, D. C.
Post Office

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED